REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 22-39 are pending, in which claims 1-21 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 22-39 are newly presented. The Specification is also amended to fix a typographical error. No new matter is introduced.

The Office Action mailed October 28, 2004 rejected claims 6 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, for indefiniteness, claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-11, 13-14, 16-18, and 20 under 32 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by *Asmuth* (US 4,310,726) or, in the alternative, under 32 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Asmuth* in view of *Needham et al.* (US 6,711,247); claim 3 as obvious over *Asmuth* and *Needham et al.* further in view of *Antonucci et al.* (US 6,415,018); claims 6, 12, and 19 over *Asmuth* and *Needham et al.* further in view of *Bowman-Amuah* (US 6,556,659) and the Background section of the present application; claim 7 over *Asmuth* and *Needham et al.* further in view of the Background; and claims 15 and 21 over *Asmuth* and *Needham et al.* further in view of *Antonucci et al.* and the Background.

The rejections of claims 1-21 are traversed as moot in light of their cancellation. Newly presented claims 22-39 are allowable because *Asmuth* fails to disclose individually or, in various combinations with *Needham et al.*, *Antonucci et al.*, and *Bowman-Amuah*, teach the features of the claims.

With regard to claims 22-28 and 34-39, both independent claims 22 and 34 recite "determining the base dialed number from among the respective base dialed numbers based on the corresponding one of the respective codes." This feature is not shown in *Asmuth*.

Asmuth is directed to a method for identifying a calling station in an embodiment call handling system. Referring to FIG. 2, a local central office **20** receives a 911 call from calling station **10** in municipality A and seizes an outgoing trunk to traffic service position system

(TSPS) **16**. Local office **20** also obtains the ANI of the calling station **10** and out-pulses the ANI

to the TSPS **16**. In order to identify the appropriate municipality to handle the 911 call, TSPS **16**

then transmits a message identification code, the called digits 911, and the ANI of the calling

station **10** to the database **20**. The database **20** then looks up a "fictitious number" such as 099-

0003 corresponding to the municipality of the calling station and transmits it back to the TSPS

16. The TSPS **16** then forwards the call using the assigned fictitious number, which is eventually

received by a public service answering point (PSAP) **13**, which queries the database **20** based on

the fictitious number to recover the ANI of the calling station **10**.

Asmuth does not, however, teach or suggest "determining the base dialed number from

among the respective base dialed numbers based on the corresponding one of the respective

codes." There is no disclosure in *Asmuth* that indicates that the base dialed number is determined

by PSAP **13** at all, much less that such a determination is done "based on the corresponding one

of the respective codes." In fact, *Asmuth* teaches against this feature, since the fictitious number

is used to recover the ANI of the calling station **10**, not that the dialed digits 911.

The Office Action's reasoning in the rejection of claims 1-2 that "a fictitious number

corresponding to a PSAP inherently corresponds to the first dialed number which is '911'"

assumes that a PSAP is associated with only one dialed emergency number, i.e. 911. This

assumption not only makes the affirmatively recited step of "determining the base dialed number

... based on the corresponding one of the respective codes" utterly superfluous, but contradicts

doing so "from among the respective base dialed numbers."

Since *Asmuth* teaches against the recited feature, a person of ordinary skill in the art

would not be motivated to modify *Asmuth* in view of *Needham et al.*, *Antonucci et al.*, or

Bowman-Amuah.

As to claims 23 and 29-39, *Asmuth* also fails to show "the base dialed number and each of the respective codes have the same number of digits," since the fictitious number 099-0003 has 7 digits while 911 only has 3. The other applied references *Needham et al.*, *Antonucci et al.*, and *Bowman-Amuah* are insufficient to motivation one of ordinary skill in the art to modify *Asmuth*'s principle of operation and require the caller to dial 7 digits to make 911 calls.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at 703-425-8516 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG & CARLSON, P.C.

___1/28/2005___
Date

Stephen C. Carlson
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39929

10507 Braddock Road
Suite A
Fairfax, VA 22032
Tel. 703-425-8516
Fax. 703-425-8518